



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
09/149,984	09/09/98	MUSHER, JR	W PRECI-P5407

THOMAS P MAHONEY  
660 NEWPORT CENTER DRIVE  
SUITE 710  
NEWPORT BEACH CA 92660

LM02/0503

EXAMINER
SWANN III, G

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2736	

DATE MAILED: 05/03/99

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

**Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

## Interview Summary

Application No.  
**09/149,984**

Applicant(s)  
**Mosher, Jr.**

Examiner  
**Glen R. Swann III**

Group Art Unit  
**2736**



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Glen R. Swann III (3) \_\_\_\_\_

(2) Thomas P. Mahoney (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview 29 Apr 1999

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☒ No. If yes, brief description:

Agreement ☒ was reached. ☐ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-3, 6-9, and 12-15

Identification of prior art discussed:

NONE

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

With regard to paragraph 2 of the Office action mailed 12/17/98 (paper # 3), it was proposed that claims 1, 7, and 13 would be amended to recite that each of the lamina has an inner and an outer surface and that the circuitry is printed on the inner surface of one of the lamina. It was agreed that, subject to further consideration and search, this would seem to overcome the art presently of record. Claim 2 is to be canceled. As regards paragraph 3 of the aforesaid Office action, the required support was pointed out on page 6, line 10. The change suggest in paragraph 4 will be made. It was agreed the drawings would be amended to include the reader (See paragraph 7). No specific discussion was had regarding illustration of the fabrication method recited in claims 13-16 (also part of paragraph 7).

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

**GLEN R. SWANN III**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**  
**ART UNIT 2736**

Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.